REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for a scroll wheel to control said display, the wheel extending through the top and bottom sides of the housing.

Claim 1 was rejected under Section 102 based on Griffin. Plainly, Griffin does not teach a scroll wheel "extending through the top and bottom sides of said housing."

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 has been amended to delete some material and to add the subject matter of claim

9. Claim 9 was rejected under Section 103 based on the reference to Griffin taken all by itself.

Griffin does not teach a scroll wheel that extends through both sides of the housing. The Examiner suggests that a scroll wheel that extends through only one side of the housing somehow renders obvious a scroll wheel that extends through both sides of the housing. This is perplexing since, plainly, the Griffin reference teaches away. Namely, the Griffin reference suggests facilitating manipulation of a scroll wheel by having the wheel extend through only one opening in the housing. To postulate that Griffin somehow teaches making two openings in the housing is certainly to stretch Griffin beyond anything it reasonably teaches. To the contrary, Griffin teaches away from two openings.

Absent any teaching in Griffin of any rationale to modify Griffin to include two openings so that the scroll wheel extends from both sides of the housing, the *prima facie* rejection is not made out.

Therefore, reconsideration of claim 7 as amended is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 4, 2003

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100

Houston, TX 77024

713/468-8880 [Phone]

713/468-8883 [Fax]